arXiv:hep-th/9204024v1 10 Apr 1992

LTH282
April 1992

HIGHER ORDER CONFORMAL INVARIANCE OF STRING BACKGROUNDS OBTAINED BY O(d,d) TRANSFORMATIONS

J. Panvel

DAMTP, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 3BX, UK

Abstract

Proposals that $O(d,d)$ boosts of trivial backgrounds lead to non-trivial conformally invariant backgrounds are checked to two loop order. We find that conformal invariance can be achieved by adding simple higher order corrections to the metric and dilaton.

Recently the one-loop effective action for closed strings has been shown to be invariant under an $O(d,d)$ transformation[1], generalizing earlier results on scale-factor duality[2]. This leads to the exciting possibility that new, highly non-trivial conformally invariant backgrounds may be generated from simpler conformally invariant backgrounds. The invariance of the one loop action guarantees that such nontrivial backgrounds will be conformally invariant up to one loop. However, the conformal invariance of the transformed solution is not guaranteed at higher order (though all orders arguments based on string field theory have been advanced in ref.[3]).

To show the conformal invariance of the σ-model it is only required to show the vanishing of $\bar{\beta}^g_{ij}$ and $\bar{\beta}^b_{ij}$, which are functions closely related to the metric and antisymmetric tensor β-functions. In this paper we take the non-trivial background constructed by an $O(d,d)$ transformation in ref.[4] and calculate its associated β-functions to two-loop order. Although it is not found to be conformally invariant by itself, the changes to the metric and dilaton required at two loops are simple enough to raise the hope that an exactly conformally invariant solution may be explicitly constructed.

The $O(d,d)$ invariance of the one-loop action was illustrated by Meissner and Veneziano in ref.[1]. Their argument shows that starting from the usual low energy expansion of the one-loop genus zero effective action for closed strings[5],

$$S^{(1)} = \int d^dx\sqrt{-g}\exp\{\phi\}\left(\Lambda - R - g^{ij}\partial_i\phi\partial_j\phi - \frac{1}{12}H_{ijk}H^{ijk}\right) \tag{1}$$

and assuming the metric and antisymmetric tensor fields g_{ij} and b_{ij} are functions of time only, the action may be written in a form which is explicitly invariant under $O(d,d)$ transformations.

$$S^{(1)} = \int dt\exp\{-\Phi\}\left(\Lambda + (\dot{\Phi})^2 + \frac{1}{8}\mathrm{Tr}[\dot{M}\eta\dot{M}\eta]\right) \tag{2}$$

General coordinate transformations together with $b_{ij} \to b_{ij} + \partial_{[i}A_{j]}$ always allow g and b to be written as

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & G(t) \end{pmatrix} \qquad b = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B(t) \end{pmatrix} \tag{3}$$

The other symbols represent the $2d \times 2d$ matrices[6]:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} g^{-1} & -g^{-1}b \\ bg^{-1} & g - bg^{-1}b \end{pmatrix} \qquad \eta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \Phi = \phi - \ln\sqrt{\det g}$$

It is now easy to see that a transformation that sends $\Phi \to \Phi$, $M \to \Omega M \Omega^T$, where Ω is defined such that $\Omega^T\eta\Omega = \eta$, will leave the action unchanged, and that the matrices Ω are members of the group $O(d,d)$. This guarantees the one-loop conformal invariance of any background created by an $O(d,d)$ transformation from another conformally invariant background.

Taking a particularly simple exactly conformal background suggested as an example by Gasperini, Maharana and Veneziano[4], we start with a flat metric and zero dilaton and antisymmetric tensor:

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b^2t^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \qquad b = 0 \qquad \phi = \text{ const (taken =0)} \tag{5}$$

New metrics may now be generated using an $O(d,d)$ transformation as above; however it is found that backgrounds not related to the original in a trivial fashion only arise when considering the "boost" subgroup of $O(d,d)$ defined by the matrix

$$\Omega(\gamma) = \begin{pmatrix} 1+\tilde{c} & \tilde{s} & \tilde{c}-1 & -\tilde{s} \\ -\tilde{s} & 1-\tilde{c} & -\tilde{s} & 1+\tilde{c} \\ \tilde{c}-1 & \tilde{s} & 1+\tilde{c} & -\tilde{s} \\ \tilde{s} & 1+\tilde{c} & \tilde{s} & 1-\tilde{c} \end{pmatrix} \tag{6}$$

where $\tilde{c} = \cosh(\gamma)$, $\tilde{s} = \sinh(\gamma)$ and $0 < \gamma < \infty$. For convenience and compactness we shall write all the following in terms of $c = \cosh(\frac{\gamma}{2})$ and $s = \sinh(\frac{\gamma}{2})$.

By calculating $M(\gamma) = \Omega^T M \Omega$ we may read off a new, boosted metric $g(\gamma)$, a non-zero antisymmetric tensor $b(\gamma)$ and dilaton ϕ:

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{cb^2t^2+s^2}{s^2b^2t^2+c^2} & \frac{cs(b^2t^2+1)}{s^2b^2t^2+c^2} \\ 0 & \frac{cs(b^2t^2+1)}{s^2b^2t^2+c^2} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \qquad b = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{cs(b^2t^2+1)}{s^2b^2t^2+c^2} \\ 0 & \frac{-cs(b^2t^2+1)}{s^2b^2t^2+c^2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{7a}$$

$$\phi = -\ln\left(1 + \frac{c^2}{s^2}b^2t^2\right) \tag{7b}$$

Now we shall consider the one-loop calculations of the metric and antisymmetric tensor beta functions. As guaranteed by the $O(d,d)$ invariance of $S^{(1)}$ in Eqs(1),(2), $\bar{\beta}^{g(1)}_{ij}$ and $\bar{\beta}^{b(1)}_{ij}$ vanish to this order for the metric, antisymmetric tensor and dilaton given in Eqs(7). However, to ensure the cancellation of the two-loop β-functions it is necessary to explore the effect of higher order contributions to the metric and dilaton. In fact, it turns out that the only changes necessary in Eqs(7) are to replace g_{00} by $-e^{\lambda(t)}$ and to allow for a higher order modification to the dilaton.

Replacing g_{00} by $-e^{\lambda(t)}$ causes remarkably few changes to the original Christoffel symbols. A new $\Gamma^0_{00} = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\lambda}$ is introduced and Γ^0_{11}, Γ^0_{12} are multiplied by $e^{-\lambda(t)}$, while the remainder are unchanged. The new Riemann tensor components, denoted by a tilde, also have a simple form in terms of the original components and λ:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{R}^1{}_{010} &= R^1{}_{010} + \frac{1}{2}\dot{\lambda}\Gamma^1_{01} \\
\tilde{R}^0{}_{101} &= e^{-\lambda}\{R^0{}_{101} - \frac{1}{2}\dot{\lambda}\Gamma^0_{11}\} \\
\tilde{R}^0{}_{102} &= e^{-\lambda}\{R^0{}_{102} - \frac{1}{2}\dot{\lambda}\Gamma^2_{10}\} \\
\tilde{R}^2{}_{121} &= e^{-\lambda}R^2{}_{121}
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Conformal invariance requires the functions $\bar{\beta}^g_{ij}$ and $\bar{\beta}^b_{ij}$ to vanish. We find that this uniquely determines λ and the higher order contribution to the dilaton $\delta\phi(t)$ up to two-loop order. In terms of the actual renormalization group β-functions β^g_{ij} and β^b_{ij}, potential diffeomorphisms W_i and dilaton ϕ the functions $\bar{\beta}^g_{ij}$, $\bar{\beta}^b_{ij}$, and $\bar{\beta}^\phi$ (which is the central charge at the conformally invariant point) have the following forms[7-9]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\beta}^g_{ij} &= \beta^g_{ij} + \nabla_i\nabla_j\phi + \nabla_{(i}W_{j)} \\
\bar{\beta}^b_{ij} &= \beta^b_{ij} + H^k{}_{ij}\nabla_k\phi + H^k{}_{ij}W_k \\
\bar{\beta}^\phi &= \beta^\phi - \frac{1}{2}\nabla^k\phi\nabla_k\phi + \frac{1}{2}\nabla^k\phi W_k
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

(We set the string tension $\alpha' = 1$ throughout.) At one-loop order W_i is zero while at two loops it may take nonzero values given by

$$W^{(2)}_j = \left(\mu + \frac{1}{3}\right)\partial_i(H_{klm}H^{klm}) \tag{10}$$

where μ corresponds to an ambiguity in the definition of the dilaton. Here for convenience we choose $\mu = -\frac{1}{3}$ and hence $W_i = 0$; however any choice of μ would yield equivalent results.

The vanishing of the metric and antisymmetric tensor $\bar{\beta}$-functions guarantee that $\bar{\beta}^\phi$ is a constant[9-11] (in our case it is found to be zero) so we shall first evaluate $\bar{\beta}^g_{ij}$ and $\bar{\beta}^b_{ij}$ to one loop order using the metric, antisymmetric tensor and dilaton together with the higher order corrections, $g_{00} \to -e^{\lambda(t)}$ and $\phi \to \phi + \delta\phi$. The one-loop $\bar{\beta}$ functions in Eqs(9) are given by[12-14]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\beta}^{g(1)}_{ij} &= R_{ij} - H_{ikl}H_j{}^{kl} + \alpha'\nabla_i\nabla_j\phi \\
\bar{\beta}^{b(1)}_{ij} &= -\nabla^k H_{kij} + \alpha' H^k{}_{ij}\nabla_k\phi
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Due to the $O(d,d)$ invariance of $S^{(1)}$, when we substitute the explicit forms of the background fields into Eq.(11) all 1st order terms cancel; however the corrections produce higher order terms proportional to λ or $\delta\phi$ which can be arranged to cancel the nonzero functions $\bar{\beta}^{g(2)}_{ij}$ and $\bar{\beta}^{b(2)}_{ij}$.

It is found to 2nd order (ie taking $e^{-\lambda} = 1$ and neglecting all products of λ and $\delta\phi$) using Eq.(8) that the $\bar{\beta}$-functions in Eq.(11) take the explicit form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar\beta^{g(1)}_{00} &= \frac{1}{2}\dot\lambda(\Gamma^1_{10}+\Gamma^2_{20}-\dot\phi)-\delta\ddot\phi = \frac{1}{2t}\dot\lambda+\delta\ddot\phi\\
\bar\beta^{g(1)}_{11} &= -\Gamma^0_{11}\left(\frac{1}{2}\dot\lambda+\delta\dot\phi\right)e^{-\lambda}\\
\bar\beta^{g(1)}_{12} &= -\Gamma^0_{12}\left(\frac{1}{2}\dot\lambda+\delta\dot\phi\right)e^{-\lambda}\\
\bar\beta^{g(1)}_{22} &= 0
\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

It is interesting to note that neither the proposed change in g nor ϕ may produce any cancellation of a non-zero $\beta^{g(2)}_{22}$ term. We shall see that this corresponds to fixing the choice of renormalization scheme used to evaluate $\beta^{g(2)}_{ij}$. Similarly the higher order corrections to g and ϕ give rise to non-zero components in the one-loop antisymmetric tensor $\bar\beta$-function which provides the cancellation required by $\bar\beta^{b(2)}_{ij}$.

$$\bar\beta^{b(1)}_{12} = \Gamma^0_{12}\left(\frac{1}{2}\dot\lambda+\delta\dot\phi\right)e^{-\lambda}\tag{13}$$

The forms of the two loop metric and antisymmetric tensor β-functions are considerably more complex and their calculation was greatly simplified by use of programs written in REDUCE, while analytic checks were made on the consistency of the results. At two loop order the metric and antisymmetric tensor β functions may be written[12,15]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta^{g(2)}_{ij}(\lambda) =& \frac{1}{2}R_{iklm}R_j{}^{klm}+\frac{1}{6}\nabla_i H_{klm}\nabla_j H^{klm}\\
&+\left(\frac{1}{2}-\rho\right)\nabla_k H_{ilm}\nabla^k H_j{}^{lm}+\rho R^k{}_{ijl}H_{kmn}H^{lmn}\\
&+(6-4\rho)R^k{}_{lmi}H_{jnk}H^{lmn}+2(\rho-1)R_{klmn}H_i{}^{km}H_j{}^{ln}\\
&+H_{klm}H_n{}^{lm}H^k{}_{ip}H_j{}^{pn}+H_{ikl}H_{jmn}H_p{}^{km}H^{pln}\\
\beta^{b(2)}_{ij}(\lambda) =& -2R_{klmi}\nabla^l H_j{}^{km}+\nabla_k\left(H_{ilm}H_j{}^{ln}\right)H_n{}^{km}\\
&-2(\rho-1)\nabla_k\left(H_n{}^{lm}H_{lmi}\right)H_j{}^{nk}+\rho\nabla_k H_{ijn}H^k{}_{lm}H^{nlm}
\end{aligned}\tag{14}$$

where ρ parametrises renormalization scheme ambiguity.

It is only required to evaluate these using the original metric, antisymmetric tensor and dilaton in Eqs(7) as the higher order corrections would produce terms of order ≥ 3.

It must be shown that there exists some choice of λ and $\delta\phi$ for which the sums $\bar\beta^{g(1)}_{ij}+\bar\beta^{g(2)}_{ij}$ and $\bar\beta^{b(1)}_{ij}+\bar\beta^{b(2)}_{ij}$ vanish. Since no change can be made to $\beta^{g(2)}_{22}$ by $\beta^{g(1)}_{11}$, it is a prerequisite that $\beta^{g(2)}_{22}$ must itself be zero and indeed it is found that this term is proportional to $(\rho-1)$.

$$\beta^{g(2)}_{22} = -\frac{16c^2s^4b^4(\rho-1)}{(s^2b^2t^2+c^2)^4}(s^2b^2t^2-c^2)\tag{15}$$

This fixes our choice of ρ, removing the renormalization scheme ambiguity present in the calculation of the two loop functions. Choosing $\rho = 1$ allows the remaining components of $\beta^{g(2)}_{ij}$ and $\beta^{b(2)}_{ij}$ to be written in a compact form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta^{g(2)}_{00} &= -\frac{4s^6b^6t^2}{(s^2b^2t^2+c^2)^3} \\
\beta^{g(2)}_{11} &= -\Gamma^0_{\ 11}\frac{4s^6b^6t^3}{(s^2b^2t^2+c^2)^3} \\
\beta^{g(2)}_{12} &= -\Gamma^0_{\ 12}\frac{4s^6b^6t^3}{(s^2b^2t^2+c^2)^3} \\
\beta^{b(2)}_{12} &= \Gamma^0_{\ 12}\frac{4s^6b^6t^3}{(s^2b^2t^2+c^2)^3}
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

All other components are either identically zero term by term or are trivially related to the above by symmetry. Comparison of Eqs(12),(13),(16) shows a remarkable uniformity amongst the two-loop components $\bar{\beta}^{g(2)}_{11}$, $\bar{\beta}^{g(2)}_{12}$, $\bar{\beta}^{b(2)}_{12}$, and the corresponding $\bar{\beta}^{g(1)}_{ij}$, $\bar{\beta}^{b(1)}_{ij}$. As a consequence $\bar{\beta}^{g(1)}_{ij} + \bar{\beta}^{g(2)}_{ij}$ and $\bar{\beta}^{b(1)}_{ij} + \bar{\beta}^{b(2)}_{ij}$ can be arranged to vanish by imposing only two constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\dot{\lambda} + t\delta\ddot{\phi} &= \frac{4s^6b^6t^3}{(s^2b^2t^2+c^2)^3} \\
\frac{1}{2}\dot{\lambda} + \delta\dot{\phi} &= -\frac{4s^6b^6t^3}{(s^2b^2t^2+c^2)^3}
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Solving for a second order ODE in $\delta\phi$ immediately gives $\delta\dot{\phi}$ and hence $\dot{\lambda}$. These may again be integrated analytically giving $\delta\phi$ and λ uniquely up to constants. The results are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\dot{\phi} &= \frac{-2s^4b^4t}{(s^2b^2t^2+c^2)^2} & \delta\phi &= \frac{s^2b^2}{(s^2b^2t^2+c^2)} \\
\dot{\lambda} &= -\frac{4s^4b^4t(s^2b^2t^2-c^2)}{(s^2b^2t^2+c^2)^3} & \lambda &= \frac{2(s^4b^4t^2)}{(s^2b^2t^2+c^2)^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Although the dilaton $\bar{\beta}$-function is now guaranteed to be a constant it is a useful check on consistency to be sure that this is indeed so. It is also a worthwhile exercise as the value of the dilaton $\bar{\beta}$-function relates to the conformal charge contributed by the three fields (t, x_1, x_2) considered. The general form of the dilaton β-function at one and two loops is given by[7,9,11,16]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta^{\phi(1)} =& \ \frac{1}{3}H_{klm}H^{klm}+\frac{1}{2}\nabla^2\phi\\
\beta^{\phi(2)} =& -\frac{1}{8}R_{klmn}R^{klmn}+\frac{1}{2}(5+12\mu)R_{klmn}H_p{}^{ln}H^{pkm}\\
&-\left(\frac{1}{6}+\mu\right)\nabla_k H_{lmn}\nabla^k H^{lmn}+\left(\frac{1}{4}+\rho+3\mu\right)H_{kmn}H_l{}^{mn}H^{kpq}H^l{}_{pq}\\
&-\frac{5}{12}H_{klm}H^k{}_{np}H_q{}^{ln}H^{qmp}-\frac{1}{2}\nabla_k\nabla_l\phi H^{kmn}H^l{}_{mn}
\end{aligned}
\tag{19}
$$

As discussed earlier we take for convenience $\mu = -\frac{1}{3}$ (so that $W_i^{(2)} = 0$) and we must also take $\rho = 1$ to ensure that $\beta_{22}^{g(2)}$ vanishes. With these values for μ and ρ, and with the background of Eqs(7) together with the corrections to g_{00} and ϕ, we find from Eqs(7),(9),(19), that the $\bar\beta^{\phi(1)}$ and $\bar\beta^{\phi(2)}$ reduce to:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar\beta^{\phi(1)} &= -\frac{\delta\ddot\phi}{2e^{\lambda}}-\frac{\delta\dot\phi(3s^2b^2t^2+c^2)+s^2b^2t^2\dot\lambda\}}{2e^{\lambda}(s^2b^2t^2+c^2)t}\\
\bar\beta^{\phi(2)} &= -\frac{s^4b^4\left(2s^4b^4t^4+2c^4\right)}{(s^2b^2t^2+c^2)^4}
\end{aligned}
\tag{20}
$$

so that with $\delta\dot\phi$ and $\dot\lambda$ as given by Eq.(18), $\bar\beta^{\phi(1)}+\bar\beta^{\phi(2)}$ vanishes to this order. Hence the contribution to the central charge from the (t, x_1, x_2) sector of the theory is zero, and this seems likely to persist to all orders. (Of course additional free fields can be added to ensure the correct critical value of the central charge.)

We have shown that although the one-loop beta functions for a boosted metric vanish, at two-loops simple corrections to the metric and dilaton are required to preserve conformal invariance. This is analogous to results found by Tseytlin[17] in the context of conventional duality.

Sen[3] argues, using string field theory that the $O(d,d)$ invariance should persist to all orders in perturbation theory. He suggests that the transformed metric, dilaton and antisymmetric tensor might require corrections at a higher order, which he speculates might be expressible in terms of covariant quantities, e.g. $\delta g_{ij} \propto R_{ij}$. The corrections we have found do not appear to be of this form, which raises doubts as to whether the $O(d,d)$ invariance is exactly preserved at higher orders. Nevertheless the corrections we have found at two loops are sufficiently simple to suggest that there may be an explicit modified version of the transformed solution which is conformally invariant to all orders in perturbation theory. In another recent paper[18] Sen shows how to construct solutions with torsion by acting with $O(d,d)$ transformations on the 2-d string black hole solution of Witten[19]. Based on the results we have found here, we speculate that again simple modifications might suffice to render such solutions valid at two loops and higher.

Acknowledgements

J.P. thanks the SERC for financial support and Ian Jack for advice and discussions.

References

1. K.A. Meissner and G. Veneziano, Phys. Lett. B267 (1991) 33.
2. G. Veneziano, Phys. Lett. B265 (1991) 287.
3. A. Sen, Phys. Lett. B271 (1991) 295.
4. M. Gasperini, J. Maharana and G. Veneziano, Phys. Lett. B272 (1991) 277.
5. C. G. Callan, D. Friedan, E. J. Martinec and M. J. Perry, Nucl. Phys. B262 (1985) 593.
6. A. Giveon, E. Rabinovici and G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. B322 (1989) 167;
   A. Shapere and F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. B320 (1988) 669.
7. A. A. Tseytlin, Phys. Lett. B178 (1986) 34.
8. G. M. Shore, Nucl. Phys. B286 (1987) 349.
9. A. A. Tseytlin, Nucl. Phys. B294 (1987) 383.
10. G. Curci and G. Paffuti, Nucl. Phys. B286 (1987) 399.
11. H. Osborn, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 200 (1990) 1.
12. D. Friedan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 45 (1980) 1057; Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 163 (1985) 318.
13. A. A. Tseytlin, Nucl. Phys. B276 (1986) 391.
14. T. L. Curtright and C. K. Zachos, Phys. Rev. Lett. 53 (1984) 1799;
    E. Braaten, T. L. Curtright and C. K. Zachos, Nucl. Phys. B260 (1985) 630.
15. C. M. Hull and P. K. Townsend, Phys. Lett. B191 (1987) 115;
    R. R. Metsaev and A. A. Tseytlin, Phys. Lett. B191 (1987) 363;
    D. Zanon, Phys. Lett. B191 (1987) 354;
    D. R. T. Jones, Phys. Lett. B192 (1987) 391;
    I. Jack and D. R. T. Jones, Phys. Lett. B193 (1987) 449.
16. I. Jack and D. R. T. Jones, Phys. Lett. B200 (1988) 453;
    C. M. Hull and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. B301 (1988) 197.
17. A. A. Tseytlin, Mod. Phys. Lett A6 (1991) 1721.
18. A. Sen, Phys. Lett. B274 (1992) 34.
19. E. Witten, Phys. Rev. D44 (1991) 314.